

REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action of March 13, 2003 has been received and its contents reviewed. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the consideration given to the above-identified application.

Claims 16, 17 and 27-46 are pending in the present application for consideration. By this Amendment, claims 16, 17, 27, 28, 33 and 34 are amended, and new claims 47-51 are added. Claims 32 and 38 have been canceled, and claims 39-46 withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 16, 17, 27-31, 33-37, and 47-51 are pending for consideration. In view of these actions and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is now requested.

Initially, it should be noted that an Information Disclosure Statement was filed in the instant application on February 10, 2003. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner evidence consideration of the documents cited therein by providing a copy of the initialed Form PTO-1449 that was included therewith.

Referring now to the detailed Office Action, the numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. The Examiner is thanked for renumbering the misnumbered claims from "18-37" to "27-46." Applicants will refer to the claims, as renumbered, in future actions.

Claims 16, 17, and 27-38 are objected to because of the following informalities: "said at least one" fails to state a noun. Claims 16, 17, 27, 28, 33 and 34 are amended to overcome this objection to recite a "light."

Claims 16, 17 and 27-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Specifically, the Examiner contends that the method steps of irradiating a component in a film forming chamber will produce a useful article. In response thereto, claims 16 and 17 are amended herein to recite cleaning method to overcome this rejection.

Claims 16-17, 27-31, and 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0009154 to Nguyen (hereinafter Nguyen). This rejection is traversed for the reasons advanced below.

Claims 16 and 17 are amended to recite the feature of claims 32 and 38, namely, "the vapor deposition material comprises an organic light emitting material." Therefore, amended claims 16 and 17 are distinguished over Nguyen, and, thus, this rejection should be overcome.


Claims 32 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen and U.S. Patent No. 6,132,280 to Tanabe et al. (hereinafter Tanabe). Although claims 32 and 38 are canceled, rendering this rejection moot, claims 16 and 17 are amended to include the features of these claims.

One object of the present invention is to provide a cleaning method of removing a vapor-deposition material (an organic light emitting material) adhering to equipment without exposure to atmosphere. The organic EL material is very likely to deteriorate, and is easily oxidized in the presence of oxygen or water as explained, at least, in page 2, lines 11-19 of the specification. On the other hand, Nguyen discloses the step of oxidizing the metal deposition byproducts on the surface to be cleaned and introducing Hhfac vapor into the chamber to volatilize the metal deposition byproducts oxidized. (Please see claim 1, for example). Hhfac reacts with CuO, and the following reaction occurs, $2H + hfac + CuO \rightarrow Cu(hfac)_2 + H_2O$. (Please see [0033], [0034], [0035], [0036].) Since water is produced as a result of this reaction, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to use the method of Nguyen for a light emitting material, since the water is harmful for organic light emitting materials, as noted above. Therefore, there is no motivation to combine Nguyen and Tanabe et al.

In view of the amendments and argument set forth above, Applicants respectfully requests withdrawal of the pending §§102(e), 103(a) and 112 rejections.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that any further prosecution of this application can thereby be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey L. Costellia
Registration No. 35,483

NIXON PEABODY LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 800
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-9300